IMT Nuremberg Archives

H – 783

International Court of Justice

H0783-0002

Notice.

Not to be published until presented before the tribunal in open court and then only that portion actually submitted as evidence.

Ne pas publier avant présentation devant le tribunal en audience publique et seulement la partie réellement versée au dossier.

Nicht zu veroeffentlichen vor Darlegung vor dem Gericht (Tribunal) in oeffentlicher Sitzung und dann nur jenen Teil, welcher tatsaechlich zur Beweisfuehrung uebermittelt wurde.

Не публиковать до того, как представлено на публичном заседании трибунала и только ту часть, которая представлена в качестве доказательства.

H0783 -0003

I certify that none of the documents included herein have been denied by the tribunal and that this document book has been examined with the prosecution in accordance with the ruling of the tribunal dated 4 April 1946.

Je certifie qu'aucun des documents ci-inclus n'a été contesté par le Tribunal, et que ce livre de documents a été examiné par le Ministére Public suivant les règles du Tribunal, en date du 4 Avril 1946.

Ich bestaetige, dass keine der hierin enthaltenen Dokumente vom Gerichtshof abgelehnt wurden und dass dieses Dokumentenbuch gemeinsam mit der Anklagevertretung durchgesehen wurde, in Uebereinstimmung mit der Entscheidung des Gerichtshofes vom 4.April 1946.

Signature of Counsel

Signature de l'Avocat

Unterschrift des Verteidigers.

H0783 - 0004

INDEX

to the

supplementary volume

Walter FUNK

No. 13) Questionnaire to Dr. August SCHWEDLER

Exh. No. 3
Doc. No. 14) Affidavit Max AMANN

No. 15) Affidavit Heinz KALLUS

-.-.-.- -.-

H0783-0005

Exhibit No. 13

FUNK' Document Book.

Questionnaire of Dr. August SCHWEDLER.

(Former Director of the Reich Bank, constant companion of FUNK for seven years.)

Question 1: After entry into office of the defendant FUNK as Reich Minister for Economics in February 1938 and after his nomination as President of Reich Bank late in January 1939, were you his constant companion on trips?

Reply 1: I have worked with Mr. FUNK since 1 February 1938 and have accompanied him on all his travels with the exception of the time when I was soldier. Another exception is a trip to Vienna which occurred on 6 March 1944. Mr. FUNK went by rail to a meeting in Vienna stayed on for several days at the Bergerhof and returned to Berlin later. He was accompanied by State Secretary Dr. Franz HAYLER.

Question 2: Do you know anything about FUNK's visit to the concentration camp at Dachau during the first half of 1944?

Answer 2: I know nothing about FUNK's visit to the concentration camp at Dachau during the first six months of 1944.

H0783-0006

Question 3:

Do you know anything about preparations for such a visit?

Answer 3:

No preparations of any kind were ever made for the inspection of the Dachau camp.

Question 4:

Do you know anything about a conference of the Finance Ministers of the Axis powers, which allegedly took place during the first half of 1944 in Berchtesgaden, Salzburg or in the vicinity of Munich in which FUNK is supposed to have participated?

Answer 4:

I have no knowledge of a conference of Finance Ministers of the Axis powers, which was supposed to have taken place during the first half of 1944 in Berchtesgaden, Salzburg or in the vicinity of Munich. Mr. FUNK in any case did not participate in such a conference at that time.

Question 5:

Did the defendant FUNK ever visit a concentration camp?

Answer 5:

As far as I know, Mr. FUNK never inspected a concentration camp.

Question 6:

Were preparations ever made for a visit to a concentration camp by FUNK?

Answer 6:

During the time of my employment no preparations were ever made for the inspection of any concentration camp.

Signed:

Dr. August SCHWEDLER

Signed:

Leinard N. DUNKEL
Court officer

H0783-0007

(Page 3
of orig.)

With the questionnaire of Dr. August SCHWEDLER.

I herewith certify that the above is a true copy of the original before me.

Nuernberg, 26 April 1946

(signed) Dr. SAUTER
Attorney-at-law

Filed May 7 No 3

Document Book Walter FUNK Exhibit (Doc. No. 14)

Affidavit.

The former Reichsleiter Max AMANN, at present in jail in Nuernberg, states in the presence of Lt. (jg) MELTZER, a representative of the prosecution, the following:

I have been thoroughly instructed about my obligation to state the truth by Attorney-at-law Dr. SAUTER, and was informed about the fact that false testimony by me would be punishable.

The affidavit, given by me on 10 December 1940 (3501 PS) was read to me and I state about it the following:

1.) With the expression "FUNK was the soul of the ministry", I meant to say that FUNK practically became the organizer of the new Ministry (Ministry for Propaganda and Public Englightenment). According to my knowledge of his personality, he is the journalist with years of experience in connection with business and public life, who carried out the coordination of the journalistic leadership of the German press and other means of propaganda, subordinated to the propaganda ministry. I am of the conviction that FUNK was successful in the organization of the propaganda ministry mainly by his special organizational talent. As far as I know, he carried out the orders of Dr. GOEBBELS as the [illegible] faithful follower of the latter.

2.) According to my conviction, FUNK concerned himself mainly with the frictionless functioning of the large machinery of this ministry, thus he was its organizer.

In my opinion, FUNK had nothing to do with the actual propaganda activity, for instance the holding of purely propagandistic speeches, radio adresses, public meetings etc.

H0783 - 0008

H0783-0009

I do not know who the chief of the Press section of the propaganda ministry was.

3.) FUNK, as press chief of the Reich Cabinet (Reichsregierung) and as state secretary in the propaganda ministry, was a holder of a national office (Staatsamt), and he was as such the right-hand man of Dr. GOEBBELS, because he had to give daily reports about the press to Reich Chancellor HITLER. I do not know exactly whether this activity was connected with the position of FUNK in the propaganda ministry, however I believe so.

I do not know whether this activity of FUNK, his reports to HITLER, still took place after HINDENBURG's death. I myself lived mainly in MUNICH and came to Berlin only on visite.

4.) I heard at that time that GOEBBELS had daily conferences with those officials of his ministry who were active in the affairs of the press. Furthermore, I heard that FUNK held daily press conferences with the representattives of the papers, and that he gave the press the necessary instructions. All this, I do not know from my own observations, but from my journalists who were present during these conferences, for instance Captain Von WEISS.

This lasted as long as FUNK was state secretary in the propaganda ministry. I do not know whether he was press chief of the Reich Cabinet (Reichsregieru for the same length of time. I have assumed until now that the two offices were connected with each other.

I do not know whether FUNK was also present during the daily conferences which GOEBBELS held for his officials in press affairs; that is possible, but I do not consider it propable because FUNK was kept very busy with other tasks. I do not know whether the daily press reports which FUNK made in the initial period after the seizure of power to HITLER and HINDENBURG, were no longer held by FUNK, after HINDENBURG's death but by GOEBBELS.

H0783-0010

However it became known to me during the subsequent period, that later Reich Press Chief Dr. DIETRICH, (also an official of the NSDAP) took over this activity; he was constantly with HITLER and had a representative of Dr. GOEBBELS with him.

5.) During the entire time, when FUNK was State secretary in the Reich Propaganda Ministry, I did not know of one single case when FUNK suggested anti-semitism or violence in a radio speech or in a public address, or in newspaper articles. Such lectures and speeches were generally held by Dr. GOEBBELS himself, or by official speakers of the party.

To my knowledge, FUNK did not have anything to do with the organization and distribution of the speakers in the Gaus and other formations of the party and with the forwarding of propaganda material to these offices.

In lieu of oath, I affirm the correctness of the above statements.

Nuernberg, 17 April 1946

(signed) MAX AMANN

I herewith certify that the former Reichsleiter Max AMANN has made the above affidavit before me in the presence of Lt. (jg) MELTZER.

Nuernberg, 17 April 1946

Attorney-at-law

s/ Dr. SAUTER

(Dr. SAUTER)

H0783 - 0011

(Page 7 of Orig.)

Exhibit No.15

Document Book Walter FUNK

Dauchau, 9 December 1945

Ministerialrat Heinz KALIUS, born 28 August 1908 in Grottau/Upper Silesia, PW No.31 - G 6073189 appears and states:

.....

In the year 1938, I was an official in the Reich Ministry for Economy and belonged to the minister's office. In the morning of 9 November, I saw two smashed window panes on the way from the Gendarmenmarkt subway station to the ministry, but only found out in the ministry about the incidents which had occurred during the early morning hours. Shortly after my arrival, Minister FUNK arrived and called me to him at once. During the trip to the ministry he had seen numerous destructions of businesses, and was greatly displeased and excited about this. Then, he tried in my presence to make a telephone connection with Reich Marshal GOERING, Reichsfuehrer SS HIMMLER and Reich Minister Dr. GOEBBELS, who were staying in MUNICH. For reasons, not known to me to this day, this was not immediately successful. In the meantime, reports about renewed flaring up of incidents came to Minister FUNK. He then gave me the order to inform myself more specifically in person. I first called up the 6th SS Standarte in order to ask whether anything more specific about the type and extent of the incidents was known. The adjutant with whom I talked, was also only informed about what he had seen on his way to his office. He only told me that the staff was more or less in a state of alarm, because according to the opinion of the Colonel (Standartenfuehrer), one could count on a commitment of the SS against the incidents.

H0783 -0012

After that, I went to my residence and put on my SS uniform in order to be able to get by more easily during my coming walk through the city. I then watched the events in the Friedrichstadt for about half an hour. It was obvious that at this time, in any case, there was a mob eager for destruction and loot at work. In the big passage, I observed a man who was taking jewels from a destroyed display. I took this man to the nearest police station where he was taken under arrest. On the next day, by a telephonic enquiry, I found out that he was a criminal with several previous convictions. After my return to the ministry, I reported to the minister, who again and again placed long distance calls to MUNICH. I believe it was about 1400 hours when he finally obtained a connection with GOERING or HIMMLER, and at the same time the promise that immediate action would be taken against the incidents. In the afternoon when the incidents, which had in the meantime, died down, again increased, the police took action against them, and, when they assumed larger proportions, parts of the general SS (allgemeine SS) were committed in support of the police against the incidents.

Read, confirmed, signed

signed: Heinz KALLUS

The interrogator:

signed: (signature illegible)

In lieu of oath, I affirm the correctness of the above testimony, and declare myself willing to swear to them before court.

signed: Heinz KALLUS

.-.-.- .-.-.-.-.-.

I herewith certify that the above copy is a correct copy of the original held by me.

Nuernberg, 26 April 1946

signed: Dr. SAUTER

Attorney - at-law

H0783 - 0013

2 May 46

I, WANDA S. TIESZEN, Civ., X046265, hereby certify that I am thoroughly conversant with the English and German languages; and that the above is a true and correct translation of the original document.

WANDA S. TIESZEN
Civ., X 046265.

Jul May 10

SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTS FOR THE DEFENDANT FUNK/ No. 16

H0783 — 0014

H0783-0015

Notice.

Not to be published until presented before the tribunal in open court and then only that portion actually submitted as evidence.

Ne pas publier avant présentation devant le tribunal en audience publique et seulement la partie réellement versée au dossier.

Nicht zu veroeffentlichen vor Darlegung vor dem Gericht (Tribunal) in oeffentlicher Sitzung und dann nur jenen Teil, welcher tatsaechlich zur Beweisfuehrung uebermittelt wurde.

Не публиковать до того, как представлено на публичном заседании трибунала и только ту часть, которая представлена в качестве доказательства.

H0783 - 0016

I certify that none of the documents included herein have been denied by the tribunal and that this document book has been examined with the prosecution in accordance with the ruling of the tribunal dated 4 April 1946.

Je certife qu'aucun des documents ci-inclus n'a été contesté par le Tribunal, et que ce livre de documents a été examiné par le Ministére Public suivant les règles du Tribunal, en date du 4 Avril 1945.

Ich bestaetige, dass keine der hierin enthaltenen Dokumente vom Gerichtshof abgelehnt wurden und dass dieses Dokumentenbuch gemeinsam mit der Anklagevertretung durchgesehen wurde, in Uebereinstimmung mit der Entscheidung des Gerichtshofes vom 4. April 1946.

Walter Siemers

Signature of Counsel

Signature de l'Avocat

Unterschrift des Verteidigers.

H0783 - 0017

filed July 2, 1946

No.16
Exh. no. Funk 16

Document book. "Funk" Supplement.

Affirmation.

I, Friedrich Walter Landfried, at present interned by British authorities, affir

1.) I, Friedrich Walter Landfried was state secretary in the Prussian Ministry of Finance from 1933 until the end of 1944, and was at the same time from March 1939 until November 1943 state secretary in the Reich Ministry of Economics and charged to conduct the affairs of the president of the Prussian State Bank from 1 January 1945 until the end of the war.

2.) I was handed a new questionnaire which is supposed to have been composed by representatives of the four powers participating in the Nuremberg Trial and by Funk's defense counsel. In the following I have repeated the questio of the said questionnaire together with my replies.

3.) At the same time I was handed a new cross-examination which I have answered in the following with repetition of the questions.

4.) In reply to the questionnaire and to the cross-examination I testify as follows:

Question 1:

What was Funk's attitude towards the economic policy in the occupied territories?

Answer to question 1:

Funk's attitude to the economic policy in the occupied territories resulted necessarily from his basic attitude concerning the necessity of the building up of a planned overall economy of the European continent. He hoped for a German victory and German leadership in this overall economy of the continent, He emphasized at every opportunity, however, that one could not achieve European cooperation through overpowering and suppression, but that instead one would have to convince the other nations inwardly of the rightness of one's own conception, and that one should not deprive them of the possibility of preserving and realizing their intrinsic, regional interests. Only if every part of the European Economy unity will have its right and will recognize in its mind the advantage resulting to it from the cooperation, only then could a satisfactory solution be found. Since Funk wanted to prepare during the war a permanent European peace and a mutual better understanding among the European nations he rejected any exploitation of the population of the occupied territories whom he wanted to win over for Germany as friends. He acknowledged however, (especially to the military agencies) that the occupied territories will have to furnis as large a contribution as possible for the conduct of the war; that for instance, they would have to place at the disposal of the German population from their reserves or from new production, many economic products indispensible to the German populace, which goods, however, could not be manufactured any longer because of the total commitment of German industrial capacity for armament He saw in that also an important and happy solution of the problem of maintainin

H0783-0018

the economic life and the prevention of any larger unemployment in the occupied territories, he did however advocate a simultaneous satisfaction as far as possible of the requirements of the occupied territories also through the delivery of goods available in Germany and friendly countries, which were to be paid for at reasonable prices. He advocated the viewpoint that in the last analysis it was preferable also in the interest of Germany to move as many industri as possible into the occupied territories and to employ the labor i their homes instead of imploying them in German factories.

Funk regarded as necessary a joint planning reaching as far as possible, of the rationing of available war materials and the direc ion of production by ordering and prohibiting manufacture. He was only conditionally successful in carrying out his conception agains the agencies deciding the affairs of the occupied territories. Sinc he often had to oppose also military demands in the economic field the interest of the German civilian population, he was often criti- cized that he thought too much of the time after the war.

Question 2:

Was Funk as Reichsminister of Economics or in any other capacity, authorized to give orders to the military commandants or the Reich Commissioners for the Occupied Territories, as well as to the Chief of the Civil Administration in Alsace-Lorraine or other territories

Were those subordinate to the Reich Government? If not, to whom were they subordinate?

Answer to question 2:

Funk was not authorized either as Reich Minister of Economics or in any other capacity, to give orders to the named agencies. They were also not subordinate to the Reich Government. The military commandar in the occupied territories were subordinate to the High Command of the Armed Forces and above that, to the Fuehrer directly. The Reich Commissioners for the occupied territories and the Chiefs of the Civil Administration in Alsace-Lorraine as well as the Reich Governo in Danzig-West Prussia and the Warthe District and also the Governor General in Poland claimed to be exclusively under the jurisdiction of the Fuehrer. They refused to take any kind of orders from the Reich Ministers of the various departmental Ministries. The latter could only request, suggest and negotiate but they could not order. The Reich Marshal in his capacity as commissioner for the Four-Years Plan did have a right to give orders to the mentioned agencies, a right that was generally acknowledged by them. Whether this was done by order of the Fuehrer or whether the agencies in question simply submitted to the authority of the Reich Marshal, I do not know.

Question 3:

Were the economic directives for the occupied territories issued by the Commissioner for the Four-Year-Plan or by Reich Ministry of Economics or by both?

Answer to question 3:

The economic directives for the occupied territories were issued by the Commissioner for the Four-Year-Plan and not by the Reich Ministe of Economics. The Commissioner for the Four-Years-Plan issued also to the Reich Minister of Economics, directives of a general nature or with regard to individual questions Issued directives regarding th cooperation with agencies of the occupied territories. To the Commis sioner for the Four-Years-Plan the latter could only point to directi of the Four-Years-Plan or state wishes and requests, but he could no give orders.

Question 4:

What was Funk's attitude with regard to the exploitation of the occu pied territories particularly in regard to purchases on the black narked and with respect to the devaluation of the exchange value of the currencies in the occupied countries?

H0783-0019

Answer to question 4:

Even though Funk advodated the viewpoint that the occupied territorie would have to contribute to the largest possible extent to the requirements of the conduct of the war in the econonic field he did emphasize, however, at all times that a prerequisite hereto be the maintenance of an orderly economic life. A suffering starving and exploited population in the occupied territories presented - quite a part from the barbarousness of such measures which he repeatedly and strongly emphasized - a danger and not an aid for the German conduct of a war. He saw in the rapid increase of black market dealings an especially great danger to the maintenance of an orderly economic lin and time and again advocated combating them and prohibiting all Germa agencies from making purchases on the black market, under threat of strictest punishments in case of violations of the order. He found at first no understanding at all from the military agencies and only ver little understanding from the Four-Years-Plan. Only when the catastrophic effects of the inflation in Greece became evident did one succeed in carrying through step by step a limitation of the demands for supplies and of purchases on the black market, and finally in 194 in effectuating particularly in France that this be prohibited, which action was advocated emphatically also by the military commandant in France but which was not strictly complied with.

Funk rejected unconditionally a devaluation of the currency exchange values even though it was demanded time and again by the military agencies and at times also by the Commissioner for the Four-Years-Plan until the time I left the Reich Ministry of Economics in November 1943. They gave as reason that in view of the existing currency exchange rates the internal purchasing value of the money in the occupied territories did not correspond any longer to the purchasing value of the Reich Mark in Germany, and that, therefore th Armed Forces and other German agencies in the occupied territories ha to pay disproportionately high prices for all the requirements. Funk did not argue this latter fact, demanded, however, a limitation of German expenditures in the occupied territories. He pointed to the fact that the abandonment of the fixed relation between the Reich Mar and the currencies in the occupied territories would mean pulling the foundation of the latter from under them and would lead to unrestrain inflation with all its consequences. In my estimation Funk did not think in this connection of the effects of such an inflation upon the value of the Reich Mark which he considered as being secured through the general strict freezing of wages and salaries, through the firm price administration and control measures and through the prevention of any important black markets in Germany and the prohibition of any financiel speculations. He was seriously concerned with the fate of the occupied territories for which he felt a responsibility on the part of Germany. His stubborn "no" in reply to all demands for a modification of the currency exchange rates was, after all, successful

Question 5:

What was Funk's policy and what measures did he take with regard to the maintenance of the existing economic and social order in the occupied countries?

H0783-0020

What position and what measures did Funk take as regards the imposition of taxes on the occupied territories as well as regards the avoidance of inflation itself?

Answer to Question 5:

Funk alone was in no position to take measures for maintaining the economic and social order in the occupied countries. He could only make suggestions to the agencies concerned and insofar as effects on the Reich territory would come about, he could express wishes. On account of his fundamental stand described to me in reply to question 1) he put great emphasis on the demand that the economic and social order existing in the occupied countries not be affected beyond the extent necessary for the immediate requirements of waging war. Concerning these questions he often had discussions with the Reich Marshal and General Field Marshal Keitel as well as with the military commanders in France and Belgium. Especially in the field of the currency he used all his influence time and again against all tendencies having inflationary effects. Every time as soon as possible after the occupation he demanded the withdrawal of the Reichskreditkassenschein from the money circulation in the occupied territories and succeeded in having it withdrawn, By his constantly repeated remonstrations with the Reich Marshal he succeeded in fighting off all endeavors to change the relation between Reichsmark and the currency in the occupied territories to the disadvantage of the latter. Also when this question was put - I believe by the director of the Party chancellery - before the Fuehrer himself who - if I remember correctly - early in the fall of 1943 reportedly had ordered an examination and reduction of the currencyyrates, Funk went to him and returned very happy after a discussion of several hours. He told me that it was very difficult for him to convince the Fuehrer of the correctness of his opinion that any financial overload on the occupied countries and any measure having inflationary effects would put not only the countries concerned into the most difficult situation,

H0783 — 0021

but would have repercussions on the whole continent and also directly on the conduct of the war. However, he succeeded now and the Fuehrer decided that the currency rates remain unchanged.

Generally, the Reich Ministry of Economics was not concerned in determining th amount of the cost of occupation. As far as I know it was determined by the Fo Year-Plan together with the OKW and the Reich Minister of Finance. Whether Funk, in his function as president of the Reichsbank, was called in on these questions, I do not know.

Question 6:

What was Funk's attitude and what measures did he take with regard to the orders of the chief of civil administration in Alsace, Wagner, by which the latter pronounced the confiscation of the formerly French-owned industrial firms, especially of the potash mines?

a) What was Wagner's answer to Funk's objection to it, if there was one?

b) What reasons did Wagner give for his view point?

Answer to Question 6:

I remember that great differences of opinion were on several occasions fought out quite bitterly between Funk and the chief of civil administration in Alsace, Robert Wagner. Wagner then always referred to the fact that he was subordinate only to the Fuehrer and reponsible only to him. He did not care about the effect his measures had on the inner German Reich territory. The worst case remaining in my memory took place on the occasion of the rationalization of banking, ordered for the purpose of saving manpower and material.

According to the plans of the Reich Ministry of Economics, this measure was to be carried out in the entire Reich territory in accordance with uniform principles.

HO783-0022

These plans had been discussed in advance between the local service posts and the officials of the RWM, and decision was made on the proposed consolidation and shut-downs. Contrary to the plan adopted at the preliminary discussions, the closing of the branches of the large Berlin banks in favor of the Badische Bank was ordered by Wagner, without the participation of the RWM and without consideration of the effects the closing would have on the economic life, and from this he could not be dissuaded..

However, I cannot recall that discussions were carried on between Funk and Wagner relative to the confiscation of enterprises formerly in French possession in Alsace. To my recollection Wagner acted quite independently in this matter, and Funk, knowing Wagner's attitude and the impossibility of carrying his point with him, disregarded altogether having any influence on matter Only regarding the potash mine construction, as I remember, did the Reichsminister of Economics assert himself after a previous consultation with the Commissioner for the Four-years Plan and with the consent of same:
After the Alsatian potash mines were first taken into trusteeship by the Chief of Civil administration, then leased and transferred as a special estate to the Preussische Bergwerks- und Huetten A.G. (Preussag) to be managed in the interest of the war economy, while the settling of the property situation was to be postponed until conclusion of the war, efforts were made by the German concerns, which owned the postash mines before 1918 but forfeited same by the Versailles Treaty, to obtain a decision by the Reichsmarschall or the Fuehrer which would enable them to repurchase their old property before the end of the war. The Reichsministry of Economics opposed these plans from the start, because it was Minister Funk's view that these questions can be solved only after the Peace Treaty, when the requirements of the war economy had been secured in the meanwhile. Finally, the consent of the Commissioner of the Four-Years-Plan was obtained on the part of the Reichsministry of Economics to determine in conjunction with the Chief of Civilian Property Management in Alsace the agreements with the Preussag, for the judicial decision of its responsibilities and rights in managing the potash mines.

H0783 — 0023

Although the Reich Minister for Economy could assume that this was an agreement between himself and the chief of the civilian administration concerning all essential points of the contracts to be signed with the Preussag, he suddenly learned through the newspapers, that without the participation of the Reich Minister for Economy, the Chief of the civilian administration had issued a decree, which according to its formulation gave the impression that through it, the chief of the civilian administration intended to make a definitive decision concerning the property problem. Heated discussions on this subject occurred between Funk and Wagner. Finally it appeared that in this decree an unhappy formulation was involved and that the juridical consultant of the chief of the civilian administration had only intended through the decree to set the legal prerequisites for the conclusion of the contracts between him and the Preussag, but that they would be signed according to the draft planned with the Reich Minister for Economy and discussed with the Preussag, so that consequently the property problem was to be left entirely open.

Question 7:

Did you ever release an instruction, according to which the transfer to German industrialists, especially of the stock assets owned by persons and enterprises in the occupied territory, had to be carried out with the assistance of the Gestapo?

Answer to Question 7:

No. On the contrary, I would have vehemently disapproved an intervention of the Gestapo in economic affairs and would have asked the minister himself to oppose such an intervention.

Question 8:

Did you ever receive such an instruction from Funk?

H0783-0024

Answer to question 8:

No. It would have been absolutely contradictory to Funk's principles, who, when carrying out the assignment of the Commissioner for the Four-Year-Plan, to pave the way for extensive as possible an interlacing of capital (Kapitalverflechtung) with the competent offices in the occupied territories, particularly in Holland and Luxemburg (the latter at the time of its incorporation into the territory of the German Reich) and to interest German economic circles in it, repeatedly emphasized and instructed his colleagues that all compulsion should be avoided and great care should be taken that the foreign economic circles willing to accept German participation in their enterprises should be offered participation in German enterprises, which, however, would be difficult to carry out. Funk took into the bargain that he would repeatedly be reproached by various agencies for his cautious procedure with the "interlacing of capital" and its slow progress.

Question 9:

Did you in particular ever instruct Consultant (Referent) Dr. Saager to use his influence to the effect that the Accumulatorenwerke (Storage Battery Works) in Berlin-Hagen should bring about participation of a certain Mr. Leon Laval from Luxemburg in the "Societe anonyme des accumulateurs Tudor" and that the Gestapo should be asked for aid in this transaction, as the prosecution asserts, referring to document Fr. 813-814?

Answer to question 9:;

No. - I cannot recall, before I read Dr. Sauter's questionnaire of 4 February, ever having

heard of a "Societé anonyme des accumulateurs Tudor" or of a Mr.Leon Laval, or that Mr.Laval's participation was under discussion through the Accumulatoren-werke Berlin-Hagen and was being worked on in the Reich Ministry of Economics. I cannot imagine that Dr.Saager in such a case could even have considered the Gestapo's assistance. Aside from the fact that he knew the principles of the minister, as well as mine, which rejected any interference of the Gestapo in economic matters, he himself as a jurist of the old school had the strongest feeling for legality and, according to my conviction, was a determined foe of such methods.

Question 10:

Did you not, according to the prodecure in effect in the Ministry have to be informed of such a step taken by a consultant?

Answer to question 10:

In view of the fundamental meaning of such a step, the question should be answered in the affirmative. I would have seen in independent action of a consultant or a section chief in such a matter a violation of his du

Question 11:

When did the defendant Funk, in his capacity of Plenipotentiary General for the Economy, begin to occupy himself with the measures taken by the individual departments in case of war, and to what extent were these measures already planned and introduced by his predecessor in office?

Answer to question 11:

That precautionary measures in case of war were prepared in the individual departments was known to me in my capacity of State Secretary of the Prussian Finance Ministry. To my recollection, I learned about it for the first time at a session in the Reich Ministry of the Interior, which took place about the end of 1936 or the beginning of 1937. Here the question of fixing the limits of jurisdiction between the Reich Ministry of Economics and the economic offices of the Wehrmacht High Command was discussed, as well as the question of the establishment of agricultural offices and economic offices, their organization, and the delimitation of their [illegible] tasks, as well as budget questions?

H0783-0025

H0783-0026

It was pointed out that these preparatory steps would have to be taken as a precautionary measure in case of mobilisation, but also in case the economic development should necessitate the introduction of compulsory economic measures. From this I assume that in any case such preparations were made in the Reich Ministry of Economics at that time, that is under FUNK's predecessor, Dr. SCHACHT. I do not know when preparations were begun in the other departments which came under the jurisdiction of the Plenipotentiary-General for Economy. It was only in the last days of August 1939 that I first learned of the contemplated appointment of a Plenipotentiary-General for Economy in the event of war and his sphere of duties, as well as details regarding the preliminary measures taken by the departments in the event of war. These questions were dealt with in the Ministry not by me but by the "State Secretary for Special Tasks" ("Staatssekretaer fuer Sonderaufgaben"), Dr. POSSE, whose offices were in a neighboring building to the Ministry, with a special staff.

I cannot give any indications as to when Reich Minister FUNK began to deal with the steps prepared by the departments for the event of war. From the fact that he spoke to me about this for the first time in the last days of August 1939, I think I can conclude that he had not previously concerned himself with this, at least not in detail, particularly as he very rarely received State Secretary Dr. POSSE.

Question 12: Were FUNK's powers as Plenipotentiary-General for Economy in relation to the economic departments and the organisation for the execution of these powers (operational staff) transferred to the Commissioner for the Four-Year Plan, Goering? If so, will you state when this occurred, under what circumstances, and what powers remained to the defendant FUNK.

Answer to Question 12: If I judge correctly the things which occurred before my entering the Reich Ministry of Economics in March 1939, the plan for the appointment of a Plenipotentiary-General for Economy", who was to be directly subordinate to the Fuehrer and in whose hands all the economic departments (Reich

H0783-0027

Ministry of Economic, Reich Ministry for Food and Agriculture, Reich Finance Ministry, Reichsbank, Reich Labor Ministry, and the Reich Price Commissioner) were to find a supreme chief and coordination, originated with a suggestion of Dr. SCHACHT, who in this capacity wanted to create a strong position against the Commissioner for the Four-Year-Plan, who actually in peacetime already combined these powers in his hands, especially since he had the strongest opposing opinion already for the preliminary measures the whole of armament production in a broad sense was withdrawn from the authority of the Reich Ministry of Economics, transferred to the Economic Staff of the High Command of the Wehrmacht to be taken care of by its agencies the coordination of the economic departments through the Plenipotentiary-General was broken down in a decisive point. Since, in the event of war, no longer SCHACHT, but FUNK was Reich Minister of Economics, who in all questions was unconditionally subordinate to Goering as Commissioner for the Four-Year-Plan, there was from the day of his appointment really no room for a Plenipotentiary-General for Economy" beside the Four-Year-Plan, and he limited himself to signing drafts of ordinances prepared by the departments and approved by the Commissioner for the Four-Year-Plan, as well as to the actual duties of the Ministry of Economics and the Reichsbank. The agencies of the Four-Year-Plan and of the Plenipotentiary-General, however, waged a departmental and paper war with each other, while the "Operational Staffs" (Fuehrungsstaebe") hardly ever put in an appearance before the provincial governments (Landesregierungen) or provincial governors (Oberpraesidenten) and Reich governors (Reichsstatthalter), as each department communicated directly with its subordinate authorities in the province. The actual coordinated execution and direction of economy in the early part of the war lay undisputedly in the hands of Reich Marshal Goering as Commissioner for the Four-Year-Plan. It was only the formal acknowledgment of the German offensive in the West in the Spring of 1940, agreed at a discussion at the Reich Marshal's that his authority as "Plenipotentiary-General for Economy" was limited to the departmental authority of the Reich Ministry of Economics

H0783-0028

and of the Reichsbank, while for the rest it was formally transferred to the Commissioner for the Four-Year Plan. The staffs formerly working side by side and in opposition to each other in the central offices were amalgamated and the "Operational Staffs" in the province placed under the Four-Year Plan. In practice this meant for FUNK that in his capacity as"Plenipotentiary-General for Economy" he retained only the extended right to issue decrees, for which he had the authority over that of the individual Departmental Minister in this capacity, in the sphere of the Reich Ministry of Economics and of the Reichsbank for the Reich territory.

Question 13:

What attitude did Funk take in connection with acceptance of and compliance with legal provisions for compensating Jews upon their being removed from German econonic life?

Answer to Question 13:

When I was appointed to the Reich Ministry of Economicsat the end of March 1939 and for the first time came into closer contact with Funk, the legislation on the elimination of Jews from German economic life had already been made final. He never discussed with me what attitude he had taken in working or consulting on the drafts of the laws or ordinances, as he always particularly avoided criticizing before me measures or orders of the Fuehrer or of the Reich Marshal. I can, therefore, not give any indications as to what attitude Funk took in connection with the acceptance of the legal provisions.

On the other hand, Funk pointed out to me upon my taking office as State Secretary of the Reich Ministry of Economics, that in the sphere of the elimination of Jews from German economic life, the transfer of former Jewish concerns from trustee administration to the possession of Aryan applicants which the subordinate authorities were carrying out, was still being dealt with in a special department. He made it my duty to give my special attention to the activity of this department, which was staffed more with political appointees than with experts on the subject. It was to be avoided under all circumstances he said, that in the "Aryanization" of the factories, anyone should enrich himself unjustifiably.

H0783-0029

He expressed himself very strongly here that with the elimination of the Jews from German economic life, which he as such described as absolutely necessary infringements and breaches of the decreed legal meansures had occurred, without, as far as I remember, indicating individual instances of this. It was not in his power to prevent these breaches. He made it apparent that he was not in agreement with the manner and speed of the elimination of the Jews from economic life. With obvious strong feeling he emphasized that if a legal procedure had been laid down with the signature of the Fuehrer, no Department in Germany may disregard these measures. I know that Funk many times had animated discussions on these questions with Gauleiters and that he made no secret to them of his attitude. My discussion with Funk on the "aryanization of factories" I remember particularly because Funk on this occasion for the first time spoke more openly on political matters regarding which he was otherwise very cautious towards me particularly in the early days. The discussion at that time had a strong impression upon me and brought Funk nearer to me as a human being.

Question 14:

You were throughout several years the closest associate of Minister Funk and, therefore, also know his character and his personal and political attitude;is that correct and what can you say in this connection?

Reply to Question 14:

I was Secretary of State of the Reich Ministry of Economics from the end of March 1939 to end of November 1943 and as such the closest associate of Minister Funk. During this time, if the Minister or I were not absent in Berlin, I spent several hours with him every day, for the most part even in conversations between just the two of us. Before my taking over office I knew Funk only just slightly from occasional business discussions which I had with him as Secretary of State in the Ministry for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda in my capacity as Secretary of State of the Prussian Ministry of Finance. Before 1933 Funk was known to me only be name as the editor of the Sto Exchange paper and from his publications.

H0783 — 0030

During the years of our official cooperation I came very close to FUNK, not on as far as work was concerned, but also personally. His relations to me were really much more in the nature of a reciprocal comradeship than those existing between a superior and a subordinate.

FUNK is basically a soft person, ready to give in and compromise, very unassuming and modest. He was always eager to bring pleasure to others. He did not like representative duties and luxury, but he was greatly dependent in his personal style of life (decoration of his official residence, etc.) upon his wife, whom he loved dearly and who had great influence upon him. He is anything but a man of violence. Inwardly he rejects every violent measure and in every situation of life he trys to find a compromise. But he is easily influenced by strong, energetic persons. Several times there were difficulties between us in connection with our work because he revoked a decision he had already made, in the way a visitor who talked to him alone and insisted energetically wanted it changed.

FUNK is primarily a receptive, critical person, extremely quick of comprehension and a master in formulation and in journalistic exploitation and propaganda.

His strength was less the creation of his own practical ideas - except in the field of money and currency, in which he was particularly interested - although he was a master in the opening and discussing of theoretical questions All the more correct was his judgment about the practicability of plans put before him, and in case of approval he knew the

H0783-0031

best ways for their execution. In his private life his main interest was in art, in all fields, particularly in the musical field.

In the office he was much more interested - as already mentioned - in banking, money, and exchange affairs. He felt that he was much more at the right place as the president of the Reichsbank than as Reich Minister of Economics.

. In my opinion, he accepted the office of Reich Minister of Economics only upon Adolf Hitler's special wish, but he himself felt that he was not quite equal to the job. For that reason he increasingly tolerated incursions of other ministers into his field of activity, even though this might involve the danger of matters connected with each other being torn apart. When his attention was called to this fact, he answered: "I am always ready to hand over part of my responsibility if others are eager to get it. For myself I do not want any new responsibilities." He suffered very much from dependence on the Party Chancellery and the Four-Year Plan. Personally he probably would have preferrdd to retire soon from his office of Minister and to limit himself to the office of president of the Reichsbank, the more so as he was often serverely handicapped in his activity by his state of health. What kept him on the job was his personal feeling of loyalty to Adolf Hitler, which was decisive for all his actions; this feeling of loyalty was also the basis of his political attitude. He had a strong love for his country and he saw in Hitler the only possibility of help for Germany, whose misery he, together with most of the German people, ascribed to the treaty of Versailles. In the summer of 1943, when I had several frank discussions with him about the war situation, about political developments at home and abroad, about many incomprehensible measures of the Party agencies, these discussions always ended with Funk's saying: "As long as the Fuehrer is alive everything can turn only to the best for Germany and the whole world." In view of the great goals, he believed that the

H0783 - 0032

mistakes and severity had to be accepted. "The Fuehrer will put everything in order as soon as he has time to do so." With this remark he avoided further discussion. However, itwas evident that he suffered greatly from the fact that he himself had no possibility of putting through changes which he felt were necessary.

Several times I observed that he went to see the Fuehrer on questions pertaining to the work of the Ministry, but when he returned after an interview of several hours he told me that he had not been able to bring up the questions. He was then so impressed by the big ideas which the Fuehrer had expounded to him, that, often for days, it was hard for him to take an interest in everyday worries and tasks.

As much as FUNK respected the Fuehrer himself and considered Reich Marshal Hermann GOERING an outstanding personality, as little - I believe - did he agree with some of the influential high Party agencies. He was much too straightforward to accept their methods. He was anything but a revolutionar. Even though, according to his career, he was not suited to "bureaucratic administration work", he fully recognized the necessity for it and the merits of a well-informed and clean staff of career officials. He always refused to issue decrees which had no legal basis, so to speak from "revolutionary law" based on his or the Party's power position. Whenever he heard of measures taken arbitrarily by State or Party agencies in his field of activity, he proceeded against them, even if persons were involved who otherwise were his friends. In this connection I recall excited arguments with the State Secretary for Tourist Traffic and Head of the Reichsgruppe (department) for Tourist Traffic in the Reich Chamber of Commerce, Hermann ESSER, and the Reich Governor and Gauleiter of Saxony, Mutschmann.

H0783 – 0033

It is true that he frequently was not able to make his ideas prevail.

To sum up, I want to say that FUNK certainly always wanted the best and that, besides many positive achievements, German economy also has him to thank for preventing many a hasty, revolutionary measure which was urged by Party offices. He had no influence at all on foreign policy. It is my firm conviction that FUNK did not believe up to the last, that war would break out. It was his conviction, as it was the conviction of the overwhelming majority of the German people, that because of her geographic situation GERMANY, like her neighbors, needed a strong army and an economic armament potential. I am convinced that in cooperating to achieve these factors within his sphere of work, he believed that he was serving peace and not wa

Question 15: What was FUNK's attitude toward the application of terror and violence? Did he raise objections to the application of terror and violence? Can you cite a few typical examples of such an objection?

Answer to question 15: As a matter of principle, FUNK was an enemy of the application of terror and violence. He emphasiz that an authoritarian state needed to employ such methods to carry out its goals least of all, because it was in a position to create the legal prerequisites for everything considered necessary by it. If within his sphere of work measures were taken without a legal basis or if existing legal provisions were not observed he took steps against such procedure.

H0783-0034

In the Ministry itself while I was in office, I cannot recall any case that would have made intervention necessary. On the other hand FUNK often had differences in this sphere with individual Gauleiters, especially with MUTSCHMANN, Saxony, who time and again attacked economists and officials without legal basis, also closed down shops, disposed of managers of enterprises and forbade markets etc. In many cases FUNK succeeded in rescinding illegal measures, in others he had to submit to political pressure, mostly to that of the Leiter of the party-chancellery. Due to the length of time and to the marked weakening of my memory by 10 months imprisonment I am sorry that I am no longer in a position to submit positive details on FUNK's attitude. But I believe I should still point out especially that FUNK did also definitely disapprove of the use of terror and force in the occupied territories. Although he was a friend of Gauleiter KOCH, EAST PRUSSIA, he was especially opposed to his policy of oppression in the UKRAINE, just as he also disapproved of the measures taken by FRANK in the Government General. For these reasons he had his Ministry not interfere in solving the problems of the occupied Eastern territories-excepting money- and banking-questions- and he also rejected the trust-administration and liquidation of valuables confiscated in Poland which was then immediately effectuated by the official in charge of the Four-Years-Plan. FUNK was aware that in such political questions he lacked the necessary power inasfar as questions not immediately in his juristiction were concerned and therefore he preferred to remain completely neutral and not to interfere in matters he could not change.

HO783 - 0035

But when the opportunity arose he did not conceal his attitude, for instance toward Martin Bormann, chief of the party office and toward Dr. LEY, chief of Reich organisations and chief of the German Labor Front. Thus he succeeded against the latter, in placing on a legal basis, through a decree by the Fuehrer and executive regulations by the Reichs-Marshal, the transfer of the cooperatives of the labor unions to the property of the DAF intended by LEY.

I certify herewith that the above is a true copy of the original.

Nuernberg 3 May 1946 signed: Dr. Sauter

attorney-at-Law.

We, Theodore Lit and Virginia von Schon, herewith certify that we are thoroughly conversant with the English and German languages; and that the above is a true and correct translation.

THEODORE LIT
X 046185

VIRGINIA VON SCHON
X 046 318

7 May 1946.

File
May 23, 1946

SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTS FOR THE DEFENDANT FUNK.

INTERROGATORY FROM EMIL PUHL.

MAY 1, 1946

Exhibit 17

Submitted
July 2, 1946

H0783 – 0036

English

H0783—0037

Notice.

Not to be published until presented before the tribunal in open court and then only that portion actually submitted as evidence.

Ne pas publier avant présentation devant le tribunal en audience publique et seulement la partie réellement versée au dossier.

Nicht zu veroeffentlichen vor Darlegung vor dem Gericht (Tribunal) in oeffentlicher Sitzung und dann nur jenen Tail, welcher tatsaechlich zur Beweisfuehrung uebermittelt wurde.

Не публиковать до того, как представлено на публичном заседании Трибунала и только ту часть, которая представлена в качестве доказательства.

H0783 – 0038

I certify that none of the documents included herein have been denied by the tribunal and that this document book has been examined with the prosecution in accordance with the ruling of the tribunal dated 4 April 1946.

Je certifie qu'aucun des documents ci-inclus n'a été contesté par le Tribunal, et que ce livre de documents a été examiné par le Ministére Public suivant les règles du Tribunal, en date du 4 Avril 1946.

Ich bestaetige, dass keine der hierin enthaltenen Dokumente vom Gerichtshof abgelehnt wurden und dass dieses Dokumentenbuch gemeinsam mit der Anklagevertretung durchgesehen wurde, in Uebereinstimmung mit der Entscheidung des Gerichtshofes vom 4.April 1946.

Signature of Counsel

Signature de l'Avocat

Unterschrift des Verteidigers.

H0783 - 0039

(Page 1
of orig.)

Funk Exh No 17

DOCUMENT BOOK

WALTER FUNK

Supplement No. 3 (Witness Emil FUHL)

submitted by

Dr. FRITZ SAUTER

Attorney-at-law.

Filed July 2, 1946

(Page 2
of orig)

WALTER FUNK

Exhibit No. 19

I request the following questions to be put to the witness Emil PUHL, former Vice-President of the German Reich Bank in Berlin.

1. The defendant FUNK took over the direction of the Reich Bank at the end of January 1939. In a letter to Hitler dated 25 August 1939 (document 699 PS of the American prosecution) FUNK declared that it had been possible " to make the German Reich so strong within and outwardly so unassailable, that even the most severe shocks in the international currency and credit system cannot affect us." All credits of the Reich Bank and the entire German Economy that could be seized were turned into gold abroad.

   a) Can you explain for what reasnn, to what extent and at what time the Reich Bank carried out those measures?

   b) In refernce to the balance in gold and foreign exchange, could the position of the Reich Bank, during the seven months of FUNK's presidency, be considerably strenghtend or did this strong position already exist when FUNK assumed the directorship?

   c) Did FUNK at any time explain to you the reason for the precautionary gold - and foreign exchange policy of the Reich Bank?
   If so, what were these reasons?

   d) Were these views influenced by the steps which he expected that other countries might undertake against Germany, in the field of credit and finance? What were your own views in reference to the matters mentioned in the above question I c ?

   e) What were FUNK's views concerning the probable development of the German-Polish conflict? Particularly, what was his view concerning the attitude of the Western Powers towards a German - Polish conflict?

2. In respect to the clearing debts and their handling , was FUNK always of the same opinion as those which he advocated in his speeches on 11 March at VIENNA and in July 1944 at KOENIGSBERG, excerpts from which are enclosed?

H0783-0040

H0783 — 0041

(Page 2
of orig
cont'd)

a) After the KOENIGSBERG speech was he questioned by those present, concerning the regulation of the "real" and "unreal" clearing debts? If so, what answers did he give?

b) What did you understand by the distinction between "real" and "unreal" clearing debts?

3. At the establishment of the exchange rate for the payment dealings in the occupied territories, did FUNK always insist that the rate be kept as near as possible to the prevailing values?

4. At the establishment of the exchange values, did FUNK advocate the standpoint that the purchasing power should be the basis, since there could otherwise be no healthy and firm basis for economic trade?

a) What were FUNK's reasons for this viewpoint?

H0783 - 0042

5. What policy did Funk advocate and what measures did he take in connection with endeavors to devaluate the currency in occupied countries, in order to be able through such devaluation measures to buy more in these countries?

   a) Which persons or which government offices demanded such devaluation?

6. What was Funk's attitude in regard to the plan to introduce in France a kind of currency based on the barter system and to furnish ration coupons for merachandise, in lieu of currency notes, only to such persons who worked for officially recognized purposes?

7. Can it be established that it was due to Funk's influence that the opposition of other government ministries to revalorization of the Danish crown was defeated? Please state which were the governmental offices.

8. What were the advantages that Denmark derived from the exchange measures which the Danish National Bank demanded?

   a) What necessitated establishment of a new bank of issue in Belgium?

9. What the use of credit notes of the German Reich Bank (treasury notes), with the marching-in of German troops in foreign countries, a necessity? Can you state anything further on this point?

10. What was the position of Funk and the Reich Bank directorate, and what were the measures they took, in regard to withdrawal of credit notes of the German Reich Bank from circulation?

11. Why did it become necessary to invalidate the exchange value of the rubel in occupied Russian territories?

12. What was the finance policy pursued by Funk and the Reich Bank directorate, and what measures did they take in occupied Soviet territories? What were their objectives in such territories?

13. What was the finance policy of Funk and the Reich Bank directorate, and what were the measures they introduced in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia and in the Government General, particularly as far as activities of banks of issue were concerned in such territories?

H0783-0043

14. What authorities were competent to determine the occupation costs and the contributions?

15. Who administered the funds derived from such payments and who determined uses of such funds?

16. What was Funk's position and what measures did he take on the strength of a recommendation made by the Reich Bank directorate, in 1944, in regard to the increase in the French costs of occupation? Was the increase carried out in spite of his objection? If so, who demanded such increase and who brought it into being?

17. Is it correct, that, simultaneously with Funk's assumption of office as President of the Reich Bank, the Reich Bank was deprived of its authority to determine the credits to be granted to the Reich, and that from that period on Hitler himself made such decisions in accordance with the demands of the German Minister of Finance?

H0783-0044

(page 4
of orig)

18. Was the Reich Bank consulted - during the pre-Hitler era - before the German Finance Ministers took decisions?

19. Is it true that the Reich Bank in its disposal of gold and foreign currency was bound by the instructions of the Four Year Plan?

Camp Altschweier, 1 May 1946

Answers of witness Emil PUHL, former Vice-President of the German Reich Bank in Berlin.

To 1.a.) For the conversion of the major part of the assets of the Reich Bank into gold, the following considerations were of prime importance: Gold reserves were considered a more secure basis than the assets abroad, which in many cases were subject to instability of foreign exchange rates. As far as I can remember, the conversions were carried out, since January 1939 only on a small scale because the surplus of foreign exchange which remained with the Reich Bank, was only small.

To 1.b.) The position of the Reich Bank, according to my knowledge did not become much stronger in the seven months of FUNK's presidency.

To 1.c.) No, the careful Gold- and Foreign Exchange Policy of the Reich Bank corresponded to a long exercised practice.

To 1.d.) FUNK did not express any particular views or guiding principles to me, however, on occasion he did give me to understand that he was in agreement with the maintenance of the careful Gold- and Foreign Exchange Policy. I assume that FUNK was of the opinion that other countries would not take any steps against Germany in the field of credits or finance. My own opinion in regard to the matter mentioned in question 1.c. is, that supported by my experiences it is necessary for the Reich Bank as a bank of issue to practise a careful gold- and foreign exchange policy at all times.

To 1.e.) Although I hardly at all engaged in political conversations with FUNK, I did not have the impression that he believed in a war on the occasion of the German-Polish conflict. Above all, I did not have the impression that he expected a war with the Western powers as a result of the German-Polish conflict.

To 2.) With reference to the Clearing Debts and their treatment, FUNK has always expressed the same views as those which he stated in his speeches

H0783 — 0045

H0783 – 0046

at Vienna and Koenigsberg. Above all, he always regarded a settlement of the debts by exports after the war as a necessity.

To 2a and b) I can no longer remember clearly enough what FUNK was asked for in detail after his Koenigsberg speech, especially concerning a settlement of the genuine and non-genuine clearing debts, as that I would still be able today to give definite information about it. The difference between genuine and non-genuine clearing debts was of no importance in practical business. The banks and clearing institutions knew only a total debit belance. I assume that what is meant by genuine clearing debts are the debts originating from normal imports, while non-genuine clearing debts presumably are those debts which were caused by deliveries or production for the common conduct of the war and whose final settlement was to take place later in the form of governmental agreements.

To 3) Yes, FUNK was opposed to any <u>arbitraty establishment of the exchange rate.</u>

H0783 - 0047

To 4) Yes, Funk was of the opinion that the purchasing power must be the basis of the exchange rate parities because otherwise the economic balance between the countries would be disturbed. Funk was always of the opinion, that war conditions were merely of a temporary nature, and that transition to peace-time economy and redemption of the clearing debts would be the easier, the more the exchange rate parities corresponded to prices and purchasing power conditions.

To 5) Funk has refused on prinicple to gain special advantage for the Reich Bank by arbitrarily changing the rates of exchange. If in discussions with the departments a change in the exchange rate parities was decided upon, corresponding negotiations were mostly initiated with the countries.

To 5a) The government agencies, which favored such arbitrary measures for individual countries were, in my opinion, the Four-Year-Plan, Gauleiter SAUCKEL, and the Foreign Office.

To 6) I cannot remember that the plan for a natural products currency (Naturalwaehrung) for France was discussed in my presence. I therefore cannot testify as to FUNK's position; however, I assume that he opposed it, as he was an opponent of artificial monetary measures.

To 7) Yes, FUNK supported the Danish request for revalorization of the Danish Crown. An opponent of this was, amongst others, the Reich Minister of Finance.

To 8) The revalorization of the Danish Crown, which had been requested by the Danish National Bank, had the primary purpose of rebalancing the devaluation which took place shortly before the war. The Main reason had its origin in inner-Danish conditions. By revalorization of the currency, an increase of the wages for Danish workers was avoided and thus an increase of the price level. The farmers had also been expected to show greater

H0783 - 0048

willingness to sell their products.

To 8a) The main reason for the establishment of a second bank of issue in Belgium which, by the way, was only reluctantly carried out, were according to my memory of a technical nature. The printing facilities for the bank notes were lacking, as the printing presses had been taken out of the country. Later on the new bank always worked in closest collaboration with the National Bank of Belgium.

To 9) Yes, the use of Reich Credit Cash Certificates (Reichskredit-kassenscheinen) in the course of occupation of foreign countries by German troops was a necessity, in order to equip the troop finance agencies (Truppenkassen) with properly administered funds. Otherwise they would have issued non-controllable requisition certificates. The Reich Credit Cash Certificates (Reichskreditkassenscheinen) forced them to keep accounts which could be examined. The inhabitants of foreign countries in this way also obtained better paper for goods delivered than the requisition certificates issued by military agencies.

To 10) As soon as conditions permitted, negotiations were initiated with the foreign countries, mostly with their banks of issue, so that the Reich Credit Cash Certificates (Reichskreditkassen-scheine) were exchanged against the bank notes of the country in question.

HO783-0049

To 11 As far as I remember, the Ruble was withdrawn from circulation, above all, because the possibility for another form of settlement according to treaty did not exist.

To 12 The financial policy pursued by FUNK with the Reichsbank direcorate in the occcupied Soviet territories aimed at assuring a stable currency in these territories. Banks of issue (Notenbanken) were established in these territories for this purpose.

To 13 In the Protectorate, the existing bank of issue was converted and a Reichsbank commissioner was assigned to it. He had the task of assisting the bank and of assuring stability of the currency by necessary financial political measures. In the General Government, a new bank of issue was funded in CRACOW because the previous BANK POLSKI had ceased to operate. Such a bank commissioner was also assigned to it for the protection of the new currency.

To 14 The Reichsbank was not competent for the fixing of the occupation costs and contributions. According to my knowledge, this came under the competency of military agencies or Reich Commissioners.

To 15 The Reichsbank did not have to make any decision concerning the use of moneys which originated from occupation costs and contributions. In the Reichskreditkassen, only such accounts were carried about the use of which the competent departments were able to dispose.

To 16 The increase of the French occupation costs was pursued outside of the Reichsbank. In any case, I do not recall a recommendation of the Reichsbank directorate. An increase was brought about, probably on the instigation of the military administrative agencies in France.

H0783 – 0050

To 17 Yes. HITLER established in a letter, signed by him personally, the amount of credits to be granted by the Reichsbank to the Reich, and that on the proposal of the Reich Minister of Finance.

To 18 No. The Reichsbank was not consulted before HITLER's decision.

To 19 The Reichsbank was bound to the directives of the Four Year Plan in its disposition over gold and foreign exchange.

(signed) Emil PUHL

The above statement was made in the presence of Lt. Col. PECHAUD, Comptroller of the Reichsbank.

Baden-Baden, the first of May 1946

Signature illegible.

H0783-0051

Cross questions in connection with question which have been addressed to EMIL PUHL by Dr. SAUTER, defense counsel of the defendant FUNK.

A. Re question 1 (E):

Was FUNK of the opinion that Germany would apply force in order to carry through its claims on Poland; in case she could not fulfil these demands by means of diplomatic negoliations?

B. Re question 2:

In case FUNK expressed any opinions regarding the settlement of clearing debts owed to occupied countries, which do not seem consistent with the opinions expressed in these speeches, will you state the intrinsic contents of these inconsistent opinions as well as when, where and under what circumstances they were expressed.

C. Re question 3:

I.) In case the reply to this question is affirmative, will you state, where, to whom and on what grounds FUNK expressed these views, and who opposed him, as well as what currencies were devaluated as a result of such opposition.

II.) With regard to (a) the large sums which Germany acquired by imposing costs of occupation (b) the German control of production and distribution in the occupied countries and (c) the utilization of financial settlements, would further devaluations of the currencies in the occupied countries compared to the Reich Mark have resulted in a substantial increase in the ability to buy up available goods in the occupied countries? Will you reply to this question in reference to each individual occupied country.

D. Re question 3 and 4:

What was the responsibility of FUNK or his subordinates or what specific measures did he or they apply in establishing the parities for t the currencies of the occupied countries? Give your reply for each of the occupied countries.

H0783-0052

E Re question 7:

I. In case FUNK advocated the revaluation, of the Danish crown, when did he do so and to whom did he do so and under what circumstances did he bring forth his arguments?

II. What were the reasons in regard to their advantage for German economy (at short or long view) favoring such a revaluation?

III. Which persons or government authorities objected to this revaluation?

IV. Did FUNK advocate the revaluation of the currency of any other occupied country? If so, will you state in each case, when, in front of whom and for what reason FUNK maintained his position and who opposed him.

V. Did FUNK advocate the decrease of the occupation-costs or compulsory loans, imposed on Denmark, Belgium, Holland, Norway or any other occupied country? In each case state when, where, under what circumstances conditions and on what grounds FUNK confirmed his position and who opposed him.

H0783-0053

Re Question 9::

F. What Government offices or persons were responsible for the large amount of notes of the Reichskreditkasse issued in occupied territories?

G. Re question 14:

I. Was FUNK represented, either personally or through a subordinate in the commercial political committee (HPA)?

II. Did the commercial political committee (HPA) deal with questions concerning occupation costs, the exchange rate of the mark, and the currencies of occupied countries?

III. Describe briefly the other questions dealt with by the commercial political committee (HPA) from 1939 to 1945.

H. Re question 16:

I. Did FUNK raise any objections against the amount originally set for the occupation costs in France?

II. Did FUNK raise any objection against any increase in occupation costs in France, aside from the 1944 increases?

III. Did he protest against the use of force in the safeguarding of goods exports from France to Germany for the benefit of the German war machine and the civilian population?

IV. If the answer to one or more of the cross questions under point H is in the affirmative, specify the measures against which FUNK raised objections and indicate in each individual case before whom, when, where and on what grounds FUNK confirmed his position and who apposed him.

V. Did FUNK raise any objections against imposing compulsory loans on France or did he advocate a decrease in their amounts? If so, state in each individual case in front of whom, when and on what grounds FUNK confirmed his position and who opposed him.

H0783-0054

Camp ALTSCHWEIER, 1 May 1946

CROSS QUESTIONS

in connection with the answers of the witness Emil PUHL, former Vice - President of the German Reich Bank in Berlin.

A FUNK never expressed an opinion to me from which one could conclude that Germany would use FORCE in order to achieve her demands on POLAND in case she could not achieve these demands through diplomatic means.

B Opinions which differ from FUNK's speeches in VIENNA and KOENIGSBERG concerning the settlement of the Clearing Debts in the occupied countries, were not mentioned by him, as far as I know.

C I At every occasion which offered itself to him, officially or unofficially FUNK has expressed the opinion that no arbitrary fixing of the parities should get the upper hand. From various persons and offices, opposition against this opinion was expressed frequently. Without evidence, I cannot state today whether devaluations, which were undertaken, are to be considered the result of such opposition.

II It appears doubtful whether Germany's capacity to purchase available goods in these countries was substantially increased in the long run by the devaluation of the rate of exchange in the occupied countries. From my experience, such devaluations would have had, among other things, as consequence an increase of the price and wage level, and perhaps also a decrease of the production, so that the advantages of devaluation would for practical purposes have been canceled out again. The amounts which Germany obtained by the levying of occupation costs, would not have changed substantially the German control over production and distribution in these occupied countries and the use of clearing agreements.

I cannot make any binding statements without studying the files because of the variety of conditions in each country.

H0783-0055

D The fixing of the parities was not decided upon by the Reich Bank, but by the competent ministries which in each case decided upon the specific measures to be taken.

E I The desire, expressed by the Danish National Bank, for raising the value of the Danish Kroner, was supported by FUNK from the beginning. The discussions were drawn out for a considerable time, and FUNK represented his opinion before the other ministries. An essential reason for his attitude was to help the Danish national economy and to increase its production.

II Germany could hope to import more agricultural products from DENMARK.

III Most of all the Reich Minister of Finance.

IV I cannot remember another unequivocal revalorization of the currency, such as took place in Danmark.

V FUNK as president of the Reich Bank, did not have to make any decisions concerning the fixing of the amount of the occupation costs or the forced loans.

H0783-0056

The fixing of the occupation costs belonged rather within the jurisdiction of the military agencies and the participating civilian administrations in the occupiedcountries.

F In any case, the Reich Bank was not responsible for the amount of the Reich Credit Bank certificates (Reichskreditkassenscheine) issued in the occupied countries. Its activity was limited to handling the cash and keeping the accounts.

G The Reich Bank was not a member of the Economic Political Commission (HPA), but was only called in as expert from case to case for advice, when bank questions were concerned.

I The representation of the Reich Bank in the Economic Political Commission (HPA) was taken care of by officials of the Reich Bank.

II The Economic Political Commission (HPA) would hardly have been allowed to concern itself with the question of the amount of the occupations costs; but it probably cooperated among others in the question of the rates of exchange for the mark, and the rates of exchange in the occupied countries.

III Since I personally did not participate in the sessions of the Economic Political Commission (HPA). I cannot enumerate the individual, exceedingly numerous economic political questions, discussed there between 1939 - 1945.

H I Since FUNK as president of the Reich Bank did not participate in the decision on the amount of the occupation costs in France, any objection is, therefore, not known to me either.

II Since the questions, presented here, did not fall within the
III jurisdiction of the Reich Bank, I cannot make any statements
IV concerning FUNK's standpoint to this question from my
V knowledge.

signed: EMIL PUHL

The above statement was made in the presence of Lt. Col. PECHAUD, Comptroller of the Reich Bank.

Baden-Baden, the first of May 1946.
Signature Illegible.

-.-.-.-.-

I herewith certify that the above copy is a true copy of the original in my possession. Nuernberg, 14 May 1946.
Nuernberg, 14 May 1946 Dr. SAUTER, Attorney-at-law.

H0783-0057

18 May, 1946.

I, JOHN B. ROBINSON, Civ., X-046350, hereby certify that I am thorough ly conversant with the English and German languages; and that the above is a true and correct translation of the original document.

JOHN B. ROBINSON
Civ., X-046350

.12.

Filed May 6

No. 18

SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTS FOR THE DEFENDANT FUNK/

H0783-0058

H0783-00059

(Page 1
of orig.)

Before me, Werner COHN, 2nd Lt., AUS, official court-room interpreter of the War Crimes Branch of the Headquarters Third U.S. Army Post of Dachau, Germany, thoroughly conversant with the German and English languages and authorized to take oath, appeared personally Heinz Karl KALLUS, and gave the following answers in German to questions submitted to him in German.

First, the court reporter was sworn in as follows:

Q: Do you Heinz BUCHHOLZ, swear by God the Almighty and Omniscient to do your best to take down the procedure of this examination truthfully and to record it?

A: I do.

Then, Heinz Karl KALLUS was duly sworn in as follows:

Q: Do you, Heinz Karl KALLUS, swear by God the Almighty and Omniscient to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

A: I do.

Q: State your full name.

A: Heinz Karl KALLUS

Q: When were you born?

A: On 29 August 1998

Q: Where were you born?

A: In GROTTKAU, Upper Silesia.

Q: What is your Nationality?

A: German.

Q: Did you know Walter FUNK personally in his capacity as State Secretary in the Propaganda Ministry?

A: Yes.

Q: When did you know him? Please state the dates.

A: From December 1936 or January 1937 on.

Q: Until when?

A: Until the conclusion of his activity as State Secretary.

Q: Did you know him in his capacity as Minister for Economics?

(Page 2 of Orig) A: Yes, from 1938 until the outbreak of war, and then during the period of my classification as indispensable, that is from September 1940 until the end of 1941.

H0783-0060

(Page 2 cont'd)

Q: 1.) Did FUNK, in his capacity as State Secretary in the Propaganda Ministry occupy himself with radio and newspaper policy, or did he concern himself only with the organization and administration of the Ministry and its installations, i.e. with economic and financial questions of the radio and motion picture inductry, of theaters, orchestras etc, and of advertising? Which activity did he mainly pursue?

A: The occupation with press and radio policy was in the Propaganda Ministry almost the exclusive domain of Dr. GOEBBELS. In these fields, FUNK concerned himself mainly with administrative and financial questions. It occured, occasionally however, that he was also listened to by Dr. GOEBBELS in questions of radio and press policy. The main activity of FUNK, because his tastes were more in this direction, lay in the field of theater and music. He also concerned himself with the organization and the administration of the ministry proper and of its subordinate agencies.

Q: Which activities did he mainly pursue?

A: It is very hard to state this in a word.

Q: Take your time and answer the question as well as you can.

A: I believe that his activity was rather equally distributed among financial and administrative questions and the artistic questions of the art department. Occasionally FUNK also went to the press conferences of the FUEHRER. I can no longer say, how often.

Q: 2.)a.) Did Jews and other persons in the so-called cultural professions apply to FUNK for protection against cultural legislation?

A: I do not know that.

Q: Did you never hear anything about requests of this kind?

A: I believe that in my time this question was already settled in the Propaganda Ministry.

Q: Thus you do not know anything about requests from Jews or other persons who applied to FUNK for protection against cultural legislation?

A: I know of such cases in the Ministry for Economics.-- I remember vaguely

(Page 3 of orig.) the case of a conductor of the Berlin State Opera, whose name was Leo BLECH, who was retained by GOERING over the opposition of GOEBBELS, where FUNK expressed himself within the Ministry for the retention of BLECH because of his superior qualities as conductor.

H0783-0061

Q: Did BLECH submit this request to FUNK personally or was this request of BLECH submitted to FUNK for him by other persons?

A: That is not known to me.

Q: Can you remember any other persons who ever submitted a request to FUNK in order to receive protection from him against the cultural legislation?

A: I cannot remember it as at least ten years have passed since then. However that does not exclude the fact.

Q: In the one case which you remember, in which FUNK intervened for Leo BLECH. I ask you:

2.)c.) What effect did what he did have on his own position?

A: I do not know whether his attitude in the case of Leo BLECH had any influence on the attitude of Dr. GOEBBELS toward FUNK. But I do know that FUNK was always "suspected" by Dr. GOEBBELS because of his generous view on this and other questions.

Q: 2.)d.) Can you mention any individual and typical cases in which FUNK intervened for persons who requested his help, and in which he received letters of appreciation from such people for his aid?

A: I can remember several such cases during his activity as Minister for Economics. As I remember, they were mostly cases in which he enabled Jews to emigrate from Germany under bearable conditions. I cannot remember any names. I only know that two or three cases from his home province East Prussia approached him and were handled by him benevolently. Whether letters of appreciation arrived for him, I do not remember anymore today. One day, early in 1938, an elderly Jewish gentleman came to me and requested me to transmit his appreciation to the Minister, this was a case which was not known to me previously. It must have been that part of the cases went right to his private residence.

Q: Can you remember the name of this elderly Jewish Gentleman?

A: No. --But perhaps I may make a statement about this. Since last year I am suffering from such a loss of memory for names that I cannot even remember the name of my tent-mates from the time of my Italian captivity.

(Page 4 of orig.) (Cross questions)

Q: a) Did FUNK ever resist the so-called cultural legislation, the execution of which caused Jews and other persons to seek his aid?

A: That is not known to me since, according to my knowledge, the question of

HO783-0062

cultural legislation had already been settled in the year 1937, when I came into contact with FUNK.

Q: b.) How many - if any - as far as you know, asked FUNK for help?

A: Is this question especially concerned with requests for aid from Jews? We had a daily receipt of perhaps 20 or 30 requests for aid of a different kind.

Q: No, not only Jews, but also from other persons.

A: I do not want to cause any confusion by confusing the Ministry for Economic with the Propaganda Ministry. For the questions always go back to the cultural legislation whereas my knowledge is mainly from the time of the Ministry for Economics.

Q: We are speaking now of things which happened at the time when FUNK was State Secretary in the Propaganda Ministry.

A: I estimate the number of requests of various kinds at perhaps 10 to 20 daily.

Q: c.) How many were affected unfavorably by the cultural legislation?

A: The requests which I remember were mostly of a different kind: Requests for employment by artists, requests for support by improverished artists.

Q: I repeat the question: How many to the best of your estimate, were affected unfavorably by the cultural legislation?

A: How many people were affected by the cultural legislation or how many of these requests were affected by the cultural legislation?

Q: How many people were unfavorably affected by the cultural legislation?

A: That is not within my knowledge.

Q: Do you have any estimate?

A: No. My actual field of work was to handle the personnel employed by the Ministry.

(Page 5 of orig.) Q: d.) In case FUNK's position was jeopardized in any way by his intervention for people who were unfavorably affected by the cultural legislation, state which members of the Nazi government were responsible for this jeopardy?

A: The position of FUNK within the Ministry of Propaganda described by me above as "suspected" rested in my opinion mainly on the attitude of Dr. GOEBBELS. I could imagine that the then chief of the press department Ministerialrat BEHNDT encouraged this opinion of Dr. GOEBBELS, Other influences were not known to me.

H0783-0063

Q: 3.)a.) Why did FUNK draft the executory provisions for the legal measures which excluded the Jews from economic life?

A: As I remember, the regulations applicable until 9 November 1938, were already on hand when FUNK took over the Ministry for Economics which was preceded by an interregnum under the immediate direction of GOERING. Several days after 9 November 1938, FUNK was ordered to come to GOERING and returned from here with the orders which were to speed considerably the aryanization procedure rather slow here-to-fore. As far as I can remember, Dr. GOEBBELS told the FUEHRER at one time that the occurrences of 9 November were an additional consequence of slow action on the sale of Jewish businesses, and thus brought about the order to FUNK to carry out the now over hasty procedure, which could be controlled by the Ministry only with great effort.

handwritten correction.

Q: Did FUNK draft the executory decrees for the legislative measures excluding Jews from economic life as a result of this order by GOERING?

A: He carried out the instructions.

Q: (Cross question)

a.) What measures did FUNK instigate in order to insure that the Jews received a just indemnification?

A: It is hard to answer this question from memory without having the appropriate legal texts available. One measure was the immediate appointment of trustees, the placarding of businesses as being under trusteeship in order to prevent further destruction of property.

Q: (a. continued) Did such measures actually assure Jews of just compensation

A: The so-called aryanization decrees themselves provided for an exact appraisal of the enterprises by experts of the Chambers of Industry and Commerce and an indemnification of the Jewish owners according to the results of these appraisals. However it is known to me that in different GAUs irresponsibly low appraisals were made and neither the competent department nor in several cases the immediate intervention of the minister succeeded in bringing about a change in the face of the opposition of the competent Gauleiter.

(Page 6 of orig.)

Q: Can you answer me with yes or no, whether the measures which FUNK issued assured the Jews actually of just indemnification?

A: In case of correct execution of the decrees, yes.

H0783-0064

(Page 5
cont'd)

Q: 4) a.) Did FUNK give you any hints in the year 1939, especially in Spring as to his opinions about the development to be expected in the German-Polish conflict?

A: No.

Q: Did he ever give you any indications of his opinion on the attitude of the Western powers to a German-Polish clash?

A: No. FUNK never spoke to me about such questions of high policy before the year 1941.

Q: 3.) a.) When did FUNK concern himself for the first time with measures for the assurance of the conversion of peace industry to war industry, i.e. with the tasks which he had to fulful in his capacity as Plenipotentiary General for Economics?

A: The time is not known to me since the very important current occurrences, classified "Top Secret" (Geheime Reichssache) were presented directly by the State Secretary or the department chiefs.

Q: 5.) b.) What type of tasks did FUNK have to execute as Plenipotentiary General for Economics? In case these tasks changed from time to time state what changes took place and when.

A: Theoretically, the task of the Plenipotentiary General for German Economics was the comprehensive direction of the entire raw material and manufacturing economy with the exception of the actual armament industry which was managed directly by the appropriate branches of the Wehrmacht. Practically such direction by the Plenipotentiary General for German Economics was not reached because of intrusions of the Four Year Plan, the TODT Ministry, and later the Ministry for Armament and War Production were too great, and because almost whole fields of work were taken from the Minister for Economics in the course of the war, such as for instance the entire electric industry and, as far as I know, in the year 1943, the management of the raw material economy which was scheduled for the armanent industry.

(Page 7
of orig.) Q: Did these tasks ever change?

A: In the course of the war, a decisive transfer of tasks from the Ministy for Economics to the Ministry for Armament and War Production took place.

Q: Can you state a date when this change took place?

A: I believe in the year 1943, I assume late in 1943, in any case after the Armament Ministry had been organized.

H0783-0065

Before signing his testimony KALLUS requested to be allowed to add the following answers to questions 2.) a.) and 2.) d.):

To 2.) a.)

In pondering the subject in question, I recalled last night the following case in which FUNK against the considerable opposition of the competent department and of the Advertising Council of German Economy issued to the Jewish owners of a large Berlin-addressbook publishing house in exceptional permit for the retentionof their concern.

To 2.) d.)

The one Jewish owner of the concern visited me frequently, perhaps ten times and each time delivered newly published addressbooks with personal notes of appreciation to FUNK.

s/ Heinz KALLUS

t/ HEINZ KALLUS

I, being the official court-room interpreter of the War Crimes Branch of the Headwuarters Third U S Army, Post of Dachau, Germany, and being able to speak both the German and English languages, swear that the entire interrogatic questions and answers of Heinz Karl KALLUS was carried out in the German language.

s/ WERNER COHN

T/ WERNER COHN, 2nd Lt. AUS
Investigator - Examiner

Subscribed and sworn to before me at Dachau, Germany, on this 19th day of April, 1946.

s/ CHARLES B. DEIBEL

t/ CHARLES B. DEIBEL, 1st Lt., MIC
Investigator - Examiner

Feb 7/2

SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENT FOR THE DEFENDANT FUNK.

Exhibit 19

Supplement 5, Dok. Nr. Exh. 19.

Interrogatory of George S. Messersmith.

Submitted July 2

H0783-0066

H0783-0067

Notice.

Not to be published until presented before the tribunal in open court and then only that portion actually submitted as evidence.

Ne pas publier avant présentation devant le tribunal en audience publique et seulement la partie réellement versée au dossier.

Nicht zu veroeffentlichen vor Darlegung vor dem Gericht (Tribunal) in oeffentlicher Sitzung und dann nur jenen Teil, welcher tatsaechlich zur Beweisfuehrung uebermittelt wurde.

Не публиковать до того, как представлено на публичном заседании Трибунала и только ту часть, которая представлена в качестве доказательства.

H0783-0068

I certify that none of the documents included herein have been denied by the tribunal and that this document book has been examined with the prosecution in accordance with the ruling of the tribunal dated 4 April 1946.

Je certifie qu'aucun des documents ci-inclus n'a été contesté par le Tribunal, et que ce livre de documents a été examiné par le Ministère Public suivant les règles du Tribunal, en date du 4 Avril 1946.

Ich bestaetige, dass keine der hierin enthaltenen Dokumente vom Gerichtshof abgelehnt wurden und dass dieses Dokumentenbuch gemeinsam mit der Anklagevertretung durchgesehen wurde, in Uebereinstimmung mit der Entscheidung des Gerichtshofes vom 4.April 1946.

Signature of Counsel

Signature de l'Avocat

Unterschrift des Verteidigers.

Copy Document Book FUNK

Supplement 5, Doc. No. Exh. 19

United Mexican States)
Mexico, Federal District)
Embassy of the United)
States of America)

GEORGE S. MESSERSMITH, being first duly sworn, deposes and says as follows in answer to the interrogatories addressed to him by counsel for Defendant FUNK:

During my residence in Berlin, and during my later frequent visits there as stated in my prior affidavits, I saw Defendant FUNK and spoke to him on one or more occasions. However, I kept no diary and I am unable to state with particularity when and where the meeting or meetings occurred, the capacity in which FUNK there appeared or the topic or topics of our conversation. My judgment on FUNK expressed in my prior affidavit is based on personal knowledge and on the general knowledge which I obtained from the many sources described in my prior affidavits.

G. S. MESSERSMITH

Subscribed and sworn to before
me, W. John WILSON, Jr.
Vice Counsul of the United States
of America, duly commissioned
and qualified, In Mexico, D.F.,
Mexico, this 7th day of May, 1946.

Service No. 4929
Tariff No. 38
No Fee Prescribed

s/ W. John WILSON Jr.
t/ WILLIAM JOHN WILSON JR.
VICE CONSUL

Seal

Certified true copy
Nuernberg, 25 June 1946

s/ Dr. SAUTER
t/ Dr. SAUTER
Attorney-at-Law

HO783-0069